



Bonnie Fogdall
09/26/2001 02:30 PM

RECEIVED

SEP 26 2001

To: SER@CRWMS
cc:

Subject: Public Inquiry

Part of Records Package / Supplement / Correction

----- Forwarded by Bonnie Fogdall/YM/RWDOE on 09/26/2001 02:30 PM -----



Naomi Lewis
09/26/2001 02:18 PM

To: Bonnie Fogdall/YM/RWDOE@CRWMS
cc:

Subject: Public Inquiry

Part of Records Package / Supplement / Correction

----- Forwarded by Naomi Lewis/YM/RWDOE on 09/26/2001 02:18 PM -----

Public Inquiry

September 26, 2001 14:13:55

IP address: 24.234.144.36

Name: Alan S. Kolsky

E-mail: ttocsnala@aol.com

Comments: I am strongly opposed to the use of Yucca mountain as a repository for hazardous waste. Guidelines from the EPA itself state ground water should be a safe distance away and the area free of geological anomalies such as earthquakes (<http://www.epa.gov/radiation/yucca/faqs.htm#concerns>). Nevada ranks third for seismic activity in the United States (<http://www.lasvegassun.com/sunbin/stories/archives/2000/sep/20/510794177.html?earthquake+r+ates>) and there is a potential for ground water contamination within three years (<http://www.epa.gov/radiation/yucca/faqs.htm#concerns>). Yucca mountain is within 100 miles of Primm and Las Vegas in the south and other populated areas north. The large number of tourists passing through the area each day are at risk of exposure in case of an accident. The routes for carrying waste pass through numerous states exposing residents to the potential risks.

Recently stories have emerged concerning individuals with false licenses to carry hazardous waste. Although no connection to threatened terrorist activity has been made at this time, wouldn't it be prudent to be careful instead of allowing the risk to continue? The train accident in Baltimore Maryland earlier this year should be considered another warning against transporting hazardous material across large distances.

I find it very strange that the guidelines of appropriate areas for storage change every time a question arises about Yucca mountain. I find it equally peculiar that other potential sites, such as Texas, are suddenly of no interest. Obviously President Bush wouldn't dare contaminate his own state.

550996

This is a blatant case of "not in my back yard"

Nevada has chosen to not have nuclear power plants yet is being forced to deal with the wastes produced by other states. I believe they should be responsible for their own waste.
Papermail: 805 Fetter Court

Henderson Nevada 89052

~~~~~